

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-31 were previously pending in the application. Claims 5-6, 15, 26-27, and 31 are canceled, and claims 1, 12, 18, and 28-30 are amended herein. Assuming the entry of this amendment, claims 1-4, 7-14, 16-25, and 28-30 are now pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

In paragraph 2, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 9, 12-18, 20-22, and 26-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Amin. In paragraph 4, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 8, 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin. In paragraph 5, the Examiner rejected claims 10-11 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin in view of Zicker. For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all now-pending claims are allowable over Amin and Zicker.

Currently amended claims 1, 12 and 18 are equivalent to previously presented claims 6, 15, and 27, respectively, rewritten in independent form.

Claim 1 is directed to a wireless communication system for providing service to mobile stations. The system has a supplemental transceiver unit (STU) that is an appliance unit having a TV receiver and whose primary function is to receive TV programs for further display on a display screen. In addition, the STU is adapted to support a direct wireless communication link with at least one mobile station.

In the rejection of previously presented claim 6, the Examiner pointed to Amin's Fig. 4 and indicated that television 110 shown therein is an example of the STU recited in that claim. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. While it is true that Amin's television 110 is an appliance unit having a TV receiver whose primary function is to receive TV programs, it is also true that television 110 is not adapted to support a direct wireless communication link with a mobile station. In fact, there is no teaching or suggestion in Amin that television 110 can act in any capacity other than that of receiving TV programs. Thus, Amin's television 110 can not be an example of an STU recited in claim 1.

Amin further discloses fixed wireless base station (FWBS) 72 that can support a direct wireless communication link with telephone handset 75. However, FWBS 72 does not have a TV receiver and its primary function is not to receive TV programs for further display on a display screen. Thus, Amin's FWBS 72 can not be an example of the STU recited in claim 1 either.

The Applicant submits that Amin does not teach or suggest a single appliance unit that can both receive TV programs and support a direct wireless communication link with a mobile station. In particular, the Applicant submits that nowhere in his specification does Amin teach or suggest that television 110 and FWBS 72 can somehow be combined into a single appliance unit. The Applicant further draws the Examiner's attention to the fact that (i) Amin's Figs. 1B and 4, which show television 110 and FWBS 72, do not show that television 110 and FWBS 72 can be directly connected to one another and (ii) Amin's specification does not suggest that television 110 and FWBS 72 can communicate with one another. The Applicant submits that, in the absence of such connection or intercommunication, there can be no fair implication that Amin contemplated combining television 110 and FWBS 72 into a single appliance unit, nor would it be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine television 110 and FWBS 72 into a single appliance unit based on the teachings of Amin.

For all these reasons, the Applicant submits that currently amended claim 1 is allowable over Amin. For similar reasons, the Applicant submits that currently amended claims 12 and 18 are

also allowable over Amin. Since the rest of the claims depend variously from claims 1, 12, and 18, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Amin. The Applicant submits therefore that the rejections of claims under §§ 102 and 103 have been overcome.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/20/2006  
Customer No. 46850  
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.  
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

/Yuri Gruzdkov/  
Yuri Gruzdkov  
Registration No. 50,762  
Agent for Applicant  
(215) 557-8544 (phone)  
(215) 557-8477 (fax)